

May 11, 1981

LB 204, 204A, 89

SENATOR CLARK: Have you all voted? Record the vote.

CLERK: (Read record vote as found on page 1925 of the Legislative Journal.) 34 ayes, 0 nays, 3 excused and not voting, 13 present and not voting, Mr. President.

SENATOR CLARK: The bill is declared passed. The Clerk will read 204A.

CLERK: (Read LB 204A on Final Reading.)

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Warner, your light is on. For what purpose...? Thank you. All provisions of law having been complied with, the question is, shall the bill pass. All those in favor vote aye. All opposed nay. I am voting aye. Have you all voted? Record the vote.

CLERK: (Read record vote as found on page 1926 of the Legislative Journal.) 37 ayes, 0 nays, 3 excused and not voting, 10 present and not voting, Mr. President.

SENATOR CLARK: The bill is declared passed. We will now revert back to LB 89. We have motions on the desk.

CLERK: Mr. President, I have a motion on the desk.

SENATOR CLARK: Read the motion.

CLERK: Mr. President, Senator Lamb moves to bracket LB 89 on Final Reading pending the receipt of the interim study report on LR 103 introduced earlier this session.

SENATOR CLARK: Senator Johnson.

SENATOR V. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, members of the body, Senator Lamb discussed with me this morning some motion on LB 89 to defer action if not to kill the bill outright because this body has before it a study concerning court redistricting and Senator Lamb is not here now to carry the motion and so I will because he and I at least talked it over a bit this morning. The motion is to bracket LB 89 until next year for consideration by the Legislature. This bill, as you will recall, would allow Lancaster County an additional district court judge. Lancaster County presently has five district court judges. Under this bill, Lancaster County could then have a sixth district court judge to serve the needs of its people. Now along the way the bill's sponsor, Senator Shirley Marsh, presented to us evidence of need of an additional judge in Lancaster County and to be truthful with you, it is not my position to dispute that evidence nor do I have any intention of disputing the evidence concerning the need of an additional judge in Lancaster County.